

THE  
TRUE BRITON'S  
CATECHISM;  
ON THE  
PRINCIPLES OF GOVERNMENT,  
THE  
RIGHTS of MAN,  
AND THE  
LIBERTIES OF ENGLISHMEN;  
INTERSPERSED WITH  
OCCASIONAL STRICTURES  
ON  
SEDITIONOUS AND DEMOCRATIC WRITERS.

---

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR; AND SOLD BY W. RICHARDSON, ROYAL  
EXCHANGE, AND W. DONALDSON, PORTSMOUTH.

1793.

---

THE  
TRUE BRITON'S  
CATECHISM, &c.

---

WHAT are the Rights of Man?

The Rights of Man are either absolute or relative.

Absolute Rights are such as belong to individuals in a state of nature, and which may be called the natural liberty of mankind. This liberty consists in the right inherent in man, as a free agent in a state of nature, endowed with the faculty of distinguishing good from evil, and with a power of choosing those measures which he thinks most to his advantage, without any restraint or controul.

B

Relative

Relative Rights are such as belong to man in a state of Society or Civil Government.

When man enters into society he makes a sacrifice of part of his natural rights or liberty, for the valuable blessings resulting from *civil liberty*. Since therefore the principal aim of society, or civil liberty, is to protect man in the enjoyment of those absolute rights which he possesses by the laws of nature, no individual, endowed with common sense, and that gives a moment's consideration to the subject, would desire to have the *equal and untroubled right* or power of injuring his neighbour, and of acting as he pleased, when he would, by the same parity of reason, be himself exposed to the like injury or action. Hence *civil liberty* secures to us no more than restraining the *natural liberty*, and checking the mischiefs that one man might do to another, upon the ground of *natural rights*; and when founded upon relative rights, it diffuses the various enjoyments of life, and tends to the general advantage and happiness of mankind.

How is Civil Liberty maintained in a State?

By

By a constitution, or system of laws, progressively framed on such wise principles, that they never restrain the natural liberty of individuals, except in those cases wherein it may be necessary for the public good \*.

What are the absolute Rights of Englishmen, in a political sense?

These rights are understood to be what is generally called their liberties, having nature and reason as the basis upon which they are erected; but when indulged beyond certain limits, these absolute rights may tend to convulse the true spirit of liberty

\* Paine has, in his Rights of Man, asserted with his usual effrontery, that England has a bad Constitution; and by his cavilling definitions of the words *Constitution* and *Government*, he wishes to insinuate that we have no *Constitution*, that Britons have no freedom, and that the Government does not originate in the people; but the force of his garbled plagiarisms from Locke, go only to prove what actually exists in France, "that where there is no law there can be no freedom," or that any constitution is better than none at all. This champion of sedition takes such a decisive tone upon matters of which he is ignorant, that people ought to be guarded in receiving the impressions which give activity to his wit, and impetuosity to his style; and that it is necessary to separate his malice from his arguments, and laying to one side his reasoning, which is bad, there will remain nothing; since we may say, with Horace, that the whole of his work resembles the dreams of a sick person, which only sees vain phantoms.

B 2

implanted



implanted in our constitution by the aids of civil government, and in the end be productive of anarchy and confusion, if not restrained within due boundaries.

What are the Liberties of Englishmen?

These liberties, which are so current in the mouths of Britons, while they are little understood by the lower orders of the people, may be reduced to three principal heads. 1st. The Right of personal Liberty. 2d. The Right of personal Security. And 3d. The Right of private Property. But in order that the principles upon which our liberties are founded may be understood, we shall endeavour to detail the outlines, with as much conciseness and perspicuity as the subject and limits of our undertaking will admit; and by thus concentrating into one point of view some leading historical facts, every British subject of common sense may discover the fallacy and malignity of the positions attempted to be established by Paine, in his Pamphlets, namely, that our Government does not originate in the people, that we have no liberty, and that the British Constitution is an usurped authority, and ought to be  
overturned

overturned by the people. Therefore, the best refutation of such unanswerable absurdities, is to reject the field of argument which obviously arises, and by adhering to plain solutions of the questions stated, with some occasional strictures upon the inflammatory pamphlets under review, we trust that no sophistry of argument will be wanted to convey conviction to the minds of True Britons.

To return, then, to the answer naturally resulting from the question relative to our liberties, we will find, by researches into the history of our country, that even in the days of Alfred the Great, (nine hundred years back) true liberty was well understood, and a mutual dependence subsisted between the Crown and the people. The people's rights were then maintained in the *General Assembly of the Nation*, called, in the Saxon language, Wittenagemont. By similar researches we likewise find, that the government was elective; but the inconveniency and ferment frequently occasioned by this mode of government, in process of time gave way to the Crown's becoming hereditary, a change more advantageous and more beneficial to posterity than the former; and that  
for

for ages, prior to the Revolution of 1688, the Crown was hereditary, and descended to the heir apparent of the deceased Monarch. But the right of election of our Kings would be still inherent in the nation, were it to happen that the Royal Family and their heirs became extinct.

For the good of posterity, our ancestors, at the Revolution, wisely declared the first branch of the Legislature, which was also to exercise the executive power, to be, as formerly, hereditary in a single person. This was, in fact, only confirming the decrees of their ancestors, and which, from experience, they found to be the best for posterity \*.

The great Charter of our Liberties, called *Magna Charta*, was the basis of our present glorious Constitution, which was obtained from King John, by the

\* Mr. Paine has declaimed much upon our ancestors taking upon themselves the power of binding posterity for ever; but in this he has shewn himself to be as much an empiric in the laws of England, as he is ignorant of the Constitution which he constantly traduces; and as his principles of subversion and retrogradation may, in every instance, be ludicrously displayed, how would he or his abettors answer this simple question.—Had our ancestors the right of binding the present generation to subvert the Government and form a new Constitution?

Barons and the People united, sword in hand \*. This Charter, among many other privileges, stipulated advantageous conditions for the people, and gave their persons and property that security which no monarchy enjoyed. It established an equality of weights and measures throughout England. It gave the merchant liberty to enter and depart from the kingdom at pleasure; exempted him from imposts, formerly exacted arbitrarily, and at the pleasure of the Crown. It protected the lowest subject from arbitrary banishment or imprisonment, and secured his person or

\* The English history points out to us, that at all times the Nobles have been forward in vindicating the rights of the people, upon this principle, that a reciprocity of interests is essential to a free mixed government. But in the ancient government of France, we find the reverse was the conduct of the Noblesse.—Witness the wars with Louis IXth. when in a treaty, which terminated in a bloody civil war, called the *war for the Public Good*, the Nobles stipulated every article in their own favour, and left the people to be more oppressed and enslaved than ever. This single instance, contrasted with the conduct of the English Barons, in stipulating for the people in the Great Charter of our Liberties, must ever be an existing theme of gratitude in the hearts of every honest Briton. But Mr. Paine, and the French Jacobins, with a view of palliating all the atrocities committed in France, have been anxious to involve the people of this country in similar horrors, thinking thereby to stigmatize the people with ingratitude to the independent Nobles, whose ancestors shed their blood in the cause of freedom, and concurred in every circumstance to assert those rights, inherent to our Constitution.



effects from being molested, otherwise than by the judgment of his Peers, and according to the law of the land.

*Magna Charta*, in conjunction with many salutary laws passed in the reign of Charles II. confirming the liberties of Englishmen, particularly the *Habeas Corpus Act*, and the Bill of Rights, passed in the reign of William and Mary, established those imprescriptable rights which we now happily enjoy.

The *Habeas Corpus* shuts the door against all oppressive measures, in imprisoning the subject. The Writ of Habeas issues from the Court of King's Bench, and extends to every county. It commands or requires, that the person who hath another in custody, is to carry him before the judge, with the date of his confinement, and the cause thereof, in order that he may be either discharged immediately, or detained according to law.

This Act fixed the different terms for bringing a prisoner before the judge, but in no case to exceed twenty days; and it contains sundry other salutary regulations, for the personal security of the subject.

The

The Bill of Rights\* is an express compact or convention between the King and the People, which, in the reign of William and Mary, passed into an Act of Parliament, entitled, "*An Act declaring the Rights and Liberties of the Subject, and settling the Succession of the Crown.*"—In this act, a solemn oath is required by the King, and in which is declared, that to impose taxes without the consent of parliament, or to keep up a standing army in time of peace, are contrary to law. The subjects, as well rich as poor, have thereby a right of petitioning the King, &c.

\* Tho' Mr. Paine, with an affectation of wit, blended with that malevolence peculiar to his character, calls this Bill, *The Bill of Wrongs and Insults*, we deem it profanation to our Catechism to make any comments upon his absurd assertions relative to this head. We shall only in general observe, that Mr. Paine's books throughout contain such unanswerable absurdities, and such a low canting mode of expression, that one is led to believe, with all his versatility of genius, he would have made a better itinerant Preacher, than a democratic Legislator.—His puns and witticisms are, like his mind, of the foulest cast.—All the positions he attempts to establish in his "*Rights of Man*" are as false, as that two and two make five; and we have only to oppose facts recorded in the history of our country, and to make Truth our unerring guide, and there will be no difficulty in refuting his ridiculous assertions, and making them fall, like "the baseless fabric of a vision."

C

This

This may be therefore called the third grand æra in the history of our constitution, and which completed the Liberties of English subjects.

Is there any other State or Government in the world, where there exists such Liberties, founded upon the principles of nature and reason, as those established in our Constitution by the above-mentioned Charter and Acts?

None that will bear the smallest comparison.

In Russia, no subject can petition the throne, until two different petitions have been presented to the minister of state; and in case of persevering, by presenting a third, and it is found grounded upon wrong principles, the petitioner subjects himself to incur the pains of death.

In the ancient Government of France, the right of petitioning was debarred—Taxation was imposed in the most arbitrary manner without the consent of the people, and the lower orders were particularly oppressed—The judges were venal—Fines were levied, and the subjects imprisoned or exiled, even at the discretion of the monarch or his minister—The  
noblesse

noblesse never asserted the rights of the people, but in general oppressed them—A standing army supported despotism, in which the officers, before receiving their commissions, were obliged to produce qualifications as nobles—The subjects were restrained from leaving the kingdom—The liberty of the press was not known, neither was that glorious institution of trial by jury—The criminal laws were often executed with injustice and severity—The proceedings of the courts were more resembling those of an inquisition, than courts of law and equity—Evidence was sworn in private, no witness permitted to be examined in defence of the party accused—Judgment was pronounced in secret, and the unhappy victim kept in dreadful suspense, until the moment his fate was announced to him by the gaoler, when he was instantly dragged to tortures.—In short, the extremes of luxury and poverty, oppression and wretchedness, pervaded twenty-four millions of subjects, in an extensive kingdom, full of resources.

Such then were the grievances in France, and which Mr. Paine and his abettors, with insidious designs, have industriously and vaguely compared in the



lump to those existing in our happy constitution. The absurdity of these comparisons, having no other foundation but bold assertion, with a view to mislead the minds of British subjects, require no argument to refute them, as they obviously choak themselves in the birth.

All the arguments adduced in the pamphlet published by James Mackintosh, Esq; (in a style, it must be confessed, more dispassionate than Mr. Paine) with respect to the incorrigibility of the ancient government of France, and the necessity of a total subversion of principles, only tend to display a striking contrast in favour of the British government, which retains the inherent principle of correcting itself of any existing grievances, that may have insensibly crept in amid the vicissitudes of time, and fluctuation of circumstances.

Great, however, as the grievances were in France, prior to the revolution, they are scarce to be compared with those that have and still continue to exist in that unhappy country, since the above period.—In a state, where instead of one chief ruler there are a thousand tyrants, each playing his part of villany, sacrilege, and rapine, under the mask of *liberty* and *equality*—

*equality*—Where murder and plunder are constituted *freedom*, and anarchy and confusion established as *law*—Where a once flourishing kingdom in arts and sciences, is drenched in blood!—Her commerce and industry, the parents of wealth, stagnated!—Her agriculture and manufactures checked!—Her treasury drained of specie, and a nominal paper, of no value, substituted in its stead!—And all the horrors of war, insurrections, and famine, staring her deluded people in the face!

It will be naturally asked, Are these the models held up by incendiary writers for our imitation?—Forbid it Heaven! Forbid it Nature! And may the sanguinary decrees \* of the regicide convention perish, with the authors, by the hands of True Britons! and thereby transmit to posterity, in proper glowing co-

\* The Decree of Fraternization, of the 21st Nov. 1792, offering to succour whatever nation might think proper to shake off its allegiance, has something in it so sanguinary, that the depravity of human nature itself revolts at, and blushes to avow. It is now obvious, that it was obliquely aimed at the envied power, splendour, and happiness of Great Britain. But vengeance is now called forth; and there is no doubt but Britons will repel the blow, punish the infamy and iniquity of the design, and avenge, with Old England's thunder, their atrocious crimes.

lours,



lours, the abhorrence with which we beheld their deliberate murder of a good and just Monarch; and the indignation excited in our bosoms, at the rapacious thirst to subvert, in one general ruin, all *law, order,* and *subordination* of our happy government, so as more easily to effectuate their malignant designs of rendering Great Britain tributary to a short-lived Republic, noted only for its crimes; upon the specious principle inculcated by their Jacobin Philosophers, "that the smaller body must fall to the greater."

How are the three fundamental Rights of personal Security, personal Liberty, and private Property, inherent to the British Constitution, protected and maintained?

These Rights are protected and maintained,

1st. By the established laws of the land, and the powers and privileges of parliament, in which the supreme legislative power of the state is vested.

2d. By the executive power being vested alone in the King, and his prerogatives so minutely laid down and ascertained, that they cannot be exceeded without danger.

3d. By

3d. By the auxiliary right of every Englishman to apply to the courts of justice for redress of grievances.

4th. By the right of petitioning the King or Parliament. And

5th. By the right of individuals having arms for their defence, suitable to their condition and rank in life.

How are these Rights and Liberties to be preserved inviolable?

By supporting our glorious constitution with our blood and treasure, so as to retain its pristine vigour and energy when in danger of being subverted by the ambitious views of factious and designing men.

Wherein consists the superior excellence of the English Government over every other form, ancient or modern?

In being a free monarchy, having the executive power vested alone in a King, holding the supreme legislative power only in conjunction with the two Houses of Parliament, and each of the branches mutually checking and restraining each other. The

People

People are a check upon the nobility, and the nobility a check upon the people, as being armed with a power of rejecting what the other has resolved; while the King is vested with a negative power upon both branches, and which is the means of preserving the executive powers vested in Majesty from encroachments; and on the other hand, this power is kept within due bounds by the House of Lords and House of Commons. Thus, then, these three branches of the state, actuated by different springs, impel the machine to action, and preserve such nice equilibrium and harmony, that none of them separately, however defective, can attempt, with effect, any measure repugnant to the constitution, or to the true liberty and happiness of the people.

Although the King is one of the three constituent parts of the parliament in acts of legislation, yet in the executive part of government he is no more than a Magistrate, and the existing laws of the land bind him equally as the meanest subject; it is, therefore, upon every sound principle of reason, that the person of his Majesty is held sacred and inviolable, as his ministers  
can

can at any time be impeached, for having advised wrong measures.

Notwithstanding the King's prerogative, of being the source of all judicial power in the state—Of pardoning offences and remitting punishments—Of coining money, of levying troops, and equipping fleets—Of declaring war, and making peace; yet, upon a sober review of all these prerogatives, we shall find him comparatively as dependent as any of our chief judges in the law, generals in our army, admirals in our navy, or dignified clergy in the church; since he depends upon the will of the nation, or in other words, the will of the representatives of the people, in granting him supplies\*, it becomes the most powerful counterpoise to any encroachments on the people's fundamental rights and liberties.

Thus a mixed Government, like ours, has such peculiar and striking advantages, that they must be obvious, upon the slightest consideration, to the most ig-

\* No Money or Subsidy Bill have their origin in the House of Lords, and the Lords cannot, in the first instance, interfere in them; and when laid before them they must either simply accept or reject them, without making any amendments.



norant; for having, as already mentioned, the executive power placed in the hands of one person, tends effectually to cherish that liberty, which our ancestors so wisely meant should ever devolve to us; at the same time, checking and restraining the pretensions of ambitious individuals in the state, who would always aim at usurping a power or authority, under some shape or other, bearing a semblance to royalty; and thereby preventing all those tumults and factions, which, in all republics, have ever been the downfall of liberty.

Independent of all the advantages already recited, our Government enjoys a striking one over every free state that has yet been established, namely, its having at all times the power of correcting any abuses that may have glided in, (more particularly the power of a periodical reformation at the death of a King) and that without running any risk of subverting the fabric. But in Republics, where *equality* is deemed the *essence* of *government*, the vain attempts to correct abuses, and to restore equality, will be found impracticable; at least it will cause the most serious convulsions in the state, and in a short time overthrow the republic.—

For

For as Montesquion observes, “ All the republics “ which boast of the perpetuity and stability of their “ Government, ought only to boast of the perpetuity “ of their crimes and abuses.” Neither have they more liberty than Rome had, at the time of the Decimvirs. But in such a Government as England, where there is a body which examines it continually, and which examines itself even, its errors or abuses can never continue long; and by the spirit of attention which necessarily pervades all orders, that energy and stability of government is preserved, or easily restored.

But it is not by opposing violent measures, and industriously endeavouring to corrupt the minds of the lower orders of the people, that a reform of any abuses of government is to be accomplished—It is not by the insidious designs of wicked and ambitious individuals to overthrow the whole fabric, that the object can be obtained; for a state, labouring under real or imaginary abuses, must be treated with mild operatives, like a convalescent body, requiring the fostering hand of remedies congenial with its constitution. The source of all abuses, and the springs

D 2

with



with which they are actuated, must be gently traced; and the remedies to be applied, like alteratives to the human constitution, ought to be slow in their effect.

What are the circumstances peculiarly advantageous to the English Government, that contribute to its stability and duration?

The circumstances advantageous to the English Government, and which will transmit our liberties unimpaired to posterity, are so multifarious, that to answer the question fully, would lead us into a train of speculations, inconsistent with the limits of our plan. In general it is necessary to observe, that by a happy combination of circumstances, the present form of government was formed upon principles the most natural, and the most congenial with the feelings and passions of mankind, united in society; because the more we analyze the three branches of our mixed government, monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy, and by blending and balancing the one with the other, the more natural beauties will present themselves to our minds, as containing all the powers which every human society would wish to establish;

and

and which, in fact, all societies, even in the early formation, have a natural tendency to adopt.

Ours is not a form of government, reared up like a mushroom, by the metaphysical "Rights of Man," declared and promulgated by men of *no rights or principles*! No; the advantages resulting from our fabric has stood the test of ages, and has progressively meliorated, and in every age gains accumulating strength; and is therefore justly styled the aggregate wisdom of ages.

Is it possible for human reason to conceive, that a government founded upon the natural rights of man, and the general happiness of the people, is to be formed instantaneously, and is to attain perfection on the false principles of theorists, and the metaphysical doctrines of reforming philosophers? No; the reverse must be obvious to the common sense of mankind; for improvements in government are progressive, like the improvements in arts and sciences; and such a constitution as ours, that has been progressively improving, and that has stood the test of ages, is more likely to retain permanency and stability, than either the existing one of America, or the discordant one of

France,

France, that suffocates itself while the seeds are engendering.

Let us for a moment turn our attention to the nature of all societies of men, and we discover that those men endowed with extraordinary corporal strength, or vigour of intellects, or both united, will ever gain an ascendancy over the rest. Some power, therefore, must of necessity fall to be divided amongst those persons, having such ascendancy over the minds of the other members of the community. This power, divided among a few, will at least, from the same necessity that vested them with it, unavoidably devolve on a single person.

If, therefore, the examples of history, point out to us the effects of power, naturally and progressively arising in all societies, we surely lessen the evil of one person's having power, by wisely admitting it, with proper restrictions and limitations; thereby making the state the birthright of the person vested with limited power, and whom we call King, Sovereign, or supreme Magistrate, or the still more endearing name of Father to his People; he must of necessity be as warmly attached to his kingdom or government, as  
any

any individual can be to his patrimonial estate; and must feel the same solicitude for the happiness and prosperity of his people, as a father naturally feels for that of his children.

By conferring on the King, personal privileges, and granting him that allowance suitable to the dignity and splendor of so elevated a situation\*, we set bounds to the evils resulting from the jealousy, ambition, and rivalry of individuals; and the marked distinction of rank and power, with which

\* Much clamour has been raised by seditious writers, on the prodigality of the nation allowing annually a *million* to the King; and with a view of imposing on the ignorant, and disposing them to be inimical to monarchy, these writers artfully pass over, in silence, the reductions that are made from that sum, and that it is not solely applied to the King's private use, or that of his family; for it is notorious, that out of this annual allowance, many officers, of great trust and dignity in the state, are paid; such as the salaries of Judges and Foreign Ministers, &c. independent of a number of pensions to the widows and orphans of deserving officers, who have bled in their country's cause. And when we reflect, that it is the splendor of the nation that is reflected in the person of Majesty, and not the unmeaning pomp and pageantry of an individual, it surely ought not to be regarded as extravagant, more particularly when we consider the thousand different channels in which it is circulated, a great part of which returns to the Treasury, by the various taxes on consumable articles; and brewers, butchers, bakers, shoemakers, tailors, &c. enjoy partial benefits from this circulation.



Majesty is vested, will be a more lasting and solid protection to our rights and liberties, than could possibly be expected from the ambitious views and jarring interests of any set of men, assuming and uniting the executive and legislative powers of a state.

Like the Sun's dazzling lustre, Majesty is placed in the centre, attracting with its powers, and animating with its beams, surrounding objects; and if we cannot prevent the effect of its rays on different objects, we can always lessen its influence of action. Those objects, therefore, that are near the blaze of a throne, must, from the nature of their situations, be peculiarly distinguished, and stand in conspicuous points of view. In pursuing the metaphor, they may be compared to planets of different magnitudes, moving in various orbits, diffusing their acquired lustres to surrounding bodies, and animating and cheering, by their benign influence, the obscurest and remotest object.

To bring the question to a conclusion, we have only to make this remark; that so long as the King of England continues to fulfil his engagements to the nation, and respects those laws which form the compact

compact between him and the people, so long will he continue to enjoy that hereditary security and stability peculiar to our government\*.

What is the chief end of the British Constitution?

It is the freedom and happiness of the people, which is maintained by that wise form of mixed government transmitted to us by our ancestors, whereby we enjoy all the advantages, but none of the defects, separately inherent to *monarchy*, *aristocracy*, and *democracy*, each branch operating upon the other for the good of the whole; and checking any abuses, or remedying any grievances, that may from time to time creep in upon either state.

The British Constitution has arisen from society to a state of maturity, hitherto unexampled. The fabric has been erected by the progressive wisdom of ages—its foundation laid by the *will* of the *people*, and the

\* There is not a single act in the present King's reign, that encroaches on public liberty; but, on the contrary, this blessing has been more universally diffused than at any other period; although seditious writers would assert, that greater encroachments have been made on public liberty, than in the reign of Henry the Seventh and Eighth.



*true rights of man*; and those distinctions of rank necessarily acquiesced to by the people, are as the pillars upon which the structure rests, giving strength, stability, and security to the whole.

Our form of government, while it excites the envy and admiration of surrounding nations, we are apt ourselves to feel its enjoyments with less sensibility than foreigners: like the sailor, who, in the constant habits of beholding the wonderful structure of that floating bulwark which he inhabits, never experiences the striking effect of the external construction, or internal regulations, impelling the body to action:—or like the manufacturer or mechanic, who having always before his eyes a beautiful piece of machinery, constructed on simple and natural principles, and moving with harmony and order, continues for ever to view it with indifference.

Illiterate persons, therefore, can have but a very imperfect idea of the fabric of a constitution like ours, which has been founded on the wisest principles of political science, and as such is likely to endure for ages; and, it is to be hoped, will, in spite of all the diabolical designs of furious democrats, continue to stand displayed

to

to the view of the world, as the most beautiful structure for imitation ever reared by human wisdom.

Is a distinction of rank and honour necessary in a free government?

Yes; it is comparatively the same in states as it is in subordinate stations in life, such as colleges, academies, schools, &c. For, in conferring honours on those persons distinguished for their eminent services or talents, we excite in the bosom of others a laudable ambition and generous emulation, which gives spring to action, and diffuses life and vigour amongst all orders of a well governed state.

Under a despotic government, as well as in a republican form, the ambition and emulation of individuals may be attended with danger, as exceeding the bounds of power to restrain it. Witness the unlimited ambition of Pompey and Cæsar, who trampled on the liberties of the Roman Commonwealth—Witness the living examples before us of the French Republic, which must, in a very short period, totally dissolve that liberty and equality aimed at, or at least convert it into the tyranny of a few leaders, and a

E 2

worse

worse state of slavery for the people, than that from which they have recently emerged; or to which it was possible for them to be subject, under the most despotic monarchy.

Although Mr. Paine, with his sanguinary scythe, would wish to mow down all distinctions of rank and titles, and thereby reduce civil society to the primitive level of hunters and shepherds; yet he has not at the same time insinuated, that his *beloved woods and plains* of America are sufficiently stocked with wild beasts and flocks, for the subsistence of twenty-four millions of hunters and shepherds; since, of the two evils, it would certainly be the least for the French to hunt for food in America, than remain on their native soil, a prey to each other, the strong assassinating the weak, to satisfy the famishing cravings of nature, and, from the necessity of their situation, becoming cannibals or antropophagists.

Why is hereditary succession to the Crown of England preferable to elective?

Because it prevents those intestine commotions and periodical scenes of bloodshed incident to the elective monarchies

monarchies. The history of ancient Imperial Rome, and a view of the modern elective empires of Poland and Germany, evince the dreadful consequences attending such elective succession; and, unless we were to suppose the individuals who compose a state to be immaculate, hereditary succession must ever be more desirable than elective; and though Mr. Paine lavishes, in his usual tone, absurd invectives against hereditary succession in every possible shape, yet the insidious drift of them is obvious, and an enlightened nation is not to be imposed upon with his flimsy and inflammatory arguments in support of his favorite levelling system. While we revere the wisdom of our ancestors, as the founders of hereditary succession, which, for the benefit and happiness of the nation, has endured so many ages, we trust it will continue to be transmitted, uncontaminated, to the Royal heirs of England, so long, and upon similar principles of right, as the inheritance of landed property descends to the subjects entitled by law.

What would be the consequences of reducing to practice the wild theories of levellers, relative to the Rights of Man, and liberty founded upon equality?

It



It is incompatible with every idea that our reason and senses can form of civil society, that all privileges should be equal and reciprocal; since, in the natural relation of things, men differ as much from each other in strength, agility of body, and in the intellectual powers of the mind, as they do in physiognomy. And as Nature herself produces these inequalities, independent of the artificial ones that arise in the progress of society, it would be attended with the most pernicious effects, to distort them in practice to the principles of equality. And the easiest method of refuting these futile doctrines of levellers, is by stating a few queries, the solutions of which are self evident.

Would it tend to the happiness of mankind, that parent and child should be equal, and that a son should usurp equal authority over his father? That the servant should, in his turn, become master? That school-boys should become teachers, and hangmen become judges! Must not men be either independent of each other, in the great link of society, or would they not be reduced to the same level of gentlemen, or all labourers? In either case, could arts, sciences,

and

and manufactures flourish, or even exist, when the natural stimulus, and artificial powers of man were suppressed?

Is it natural to suppose, upon the equalizing principles, that every man is compounded of such matter, as to unite in himself all the opposite qualities and powers of folly and wisdom, cowardice and valour, vice and virtue, humanity and cruelty; and that these should be the standard of equality, united and concentrated in each individual?

Such, then, are the chimerical objects, which false philosophy and wild theorists endeavour to establish, and the attainment of which, from the distortion of nature, would not only be subversive of all order and subordination, but would also tend to subvert every principle of morals, honour, and virtue; and besides, not possible to be acquired, without wading through seas of blood.

To carry this subject more immediately home to the senses and feelings of every man, let us suppose, that in one of his Majesty's ships, where the will of one man, which protects the whole by the rules and regulations laid down by the community at large, and where



where discipline is the soul that impels the body to action, the same as law is the soul of the state;—and that this discipline or law is destroyed by *equalizing principles*, for want of due subordination, it must be obvious that the machine becomes as it were a lifeless body.—Every person conversant in the practical knowledge of a nautical life, knows that a ship manned *wholly and equally* with able-bodied seamen, instead of the more desirable distribution of the other classes of ordinary and landmen, would not be so well adapted for the different functions necessary for the government of the floating rampart.—An able seaman would think himself degraded to become a *swabber of decks*, a *sideaman*, or an *afterguard*, which are always selected from the other classes: the powers of action would cease the moment there is an end to emulation, and general ruin would ensue. The same parity of reason holds in every other order of the state; and similar causes will produce similar effects. Since, by the slightest consideration to our great manufacturing towns, we find that the subordination of the various classes of men to each other, is what, in so great a degree, promotes that wonderful harmony and execution.

execution in every branch, and tends to the increase of the wealth, of individuals, and the prosperity and happiness of the nation.

What is the cause that a Republican Form of Government sooner perishes than any other?

Because the misfortunes and successes that alternately happen, make the people lose their liberty. The ambitious General, or corrupted citizen, would head seditious parties, to hinder the suffrages at elections. The authority of the people would become chimerical. Anarchy and confusion would at length prevail; and popular tumults would be changed into the horrors of civil war, as was the case with Rome, and which, we may venture to say, without any prophetic gift, must soon be the fate of France.

The jealousy and ambition of the chiefs in a Republic, may cause more effusion of the peoples blood in one month's civil war, than could possibly happen in several years foreign war. Witness the horrors and cruelties of civil war, under the republican chiefs of Rome, Marius and Sylla, Pompey and Cæsar. May we not, therefore, on reasonable conjecture, suppose that, if the Colossal Republic of France is ever established,

blished, that Tom Paine, before "making his exit  
"with a bare bodkin," will, one day, wield his sword,  
in support of sedition, against the daggers of *Marat*  
and *Robespierre*; and that murders, conspiracies, and  
assassinations, will universally take place, and, for  
a time, renew the Gothic ages, and render the once  
flourishing kingdom of France a dreary waste.

Had the Roman Republic been limited to a few  
flates in Italy, it might, in all probability, endured  
much longer. The Senate, by having the conduct of  
the Generals immediately under view, might have  
prevented any measures operating against the State.  
But when armies passed the Alps, and crossed seas,  
the soldiers gradually lost the spirit of citizens; and the  
Generals, who disposed of armies and countries, feeling  
their power and influence, would no longer pay atten-  
tion, at a distance, to the orders of the Senate, the sol-  
diers, therefore, would acknowledge no power but  
that of their General's, upon whom they would natu-  
rally rest all their hopes—They would no longer feel  
themselves the attached soldiers to the Republic; but  
devote themselves to their Generals, under whom  
they were accustomed to conquer and to plunder.

The

The same causes which contributed to the downfall  
of the Roman Republic, are now applicable to the  
French; but the accumulation of crimes which mark  
the career of the latter, and the vain attempt to esta-  
blish democracy over the face of Europe, must acce-  
lerate its overthrow, and which, for the good of man-  
kind, is most devoutly to be wished. It is not, in the  
natural relation of things, possible, that such an ex-  
tensive kingdom as France, can be long governed  
under a Republican Form! A people, suddenly  
shifting from one extreme to another—Led on by  
russian chiefs to commit the most outrageous barbari-  
ties, will, in the present posture of affairs, continue to  
change and subject themselves to new leaders, who  
will, in their turn, act their parts of murderers and  
assassins, holding up the *red cap of liberty* as the  
bloody symbol to palliate all the horrors committed;  
and, when it is too late, the deluded people will find  
that the authority of *all* with which they have been  
amused, is in reality no more than the usurped autho-  
rity of a few needy and unprincipled men, who divide  
the wealth of the republic among themselves, and act  
as so many hundred tyrants in the state.

F 2

From



From the style in which Mess. Paine, Mackintosh, and the other advocates for the French Revolution have extolled republican forms of government, we are upon a slight consideration led to believe, that liberty no where exists but in France and America; but, on mature deliberation, the arguments adduced by them, will appear to be the wild speculations of a day: as, from the principles so hostile to rational freedom in these forms of government, (particularly that of France) we may hazard to say, from what has already happened in the world, and without arrogating any pretensions to prophetic powers, that the licentious freedom inherent in these republican forms of government, contains the seeds of its own destruction.

The leaders of the French Republic have, in order to maintain usurped power, waded through a succession of crimes:—They have had it in contemplation only (and do not blush to avow it) to erect *freedom* and *equality* on the basis of vice, and on the ruins of religion and morals; thereby exciting in the minds of all rational men an abhorrence of their system, and convincing them that the republican legislators of France, understand neither the genuine principles of liberty,

liberty, nor retain a vestige of such morals or principles as are connected with civil government.

In short, the French Revolution, taking a review of all its leading features, separately or collectively, fills the mind with horror and disgust—With horror, at the sanguinary decrees of the convention, and the murder of an innocent monarch;—and with disgust, at the vain efforts to excite other nations to similar crimes and to establish similar scenes of anarchy in every existing government.

On a due consideration of the wealth, happiness and prosperity that the British nation has for a series of years enjoyed; can the clamours raised for a political reform be maintained on the principles of sound reason?

If the first branch of this question is admitted, temperate advocates for political reform, the latter carries its answer in the negative. But with regard to the intemperate and violent advocates for reform, we make that a pretext to cover their insidious designs. At this juncture, we may add, for the information of the lower orders, that the specious pleas and epithets



*equal representation, rotten boroughs, influence of the crown, &c.* which eternally resound at these tavern clubs, distinguished by the plausible names of constitutional societies, friends of the people, &c. are in fact so many engines made use of to clog the wheels of government, and are subservient to the real motives by which the restless and ambitious views of the members of those clubs are actuated. Thus we see men in the compound characters of members of parliament and members of different clubs of the foregoing description, strangely perverting their talents by acts of the greatest inconsistency\*; and who seem to forget, that

consistency

\* In the beginning of the Session, Mr. Fox lost ground by acts of the most glaring inconsistency. He one day, in the strongest terms, reprobated the various Associations in the kingdom for protecting liberty and property, as deeming them illegal, and represented the expediency of our Ministry sending an Ambassador to the National Convention, and in direct terms approved of the principles of the French Republic, and that same of licentious liberty which pervades all orders in that country:—But mark his inconsistency next day, when he repairs to the Hanover Square Association, and there, in glowing colours, professed his attachment to the King and Constitution, and indirectly contradicted what he had delivered on the subject the preceding day in the House of Commons, and, to crown the whole, signed the Resolutions of the Association.—In a debate in a former Session, wherein the name of Paine occurred, Mr. Fox did not hesitate to say, that his book, the “Rights of Man,” was a Libel on the Constitution of England; though his Hon. Friend Mr. Grey, in his speech the 13th of Dec. last, on the motion for addressing the Throne on

consistency of conduct in political measures, like  
nessly in the common transactions of life, is ever  
best policy.

Although England returns no more than 513 representatives, and Scotland only 45, yet if it is admitted that the 588 members are more adequate carrying on the business of national legislation, than any greater given number of 1000 or upwards, the plea of *unequal representation* is done away; more particularly when we consider, that each member, chosen for a particular county, city, or borough, is equally in parliament every district in the realm. Have not Mr. Fox and Mr. Sheridan the interest of the people of the Orkneys and Shetland, as well as the whole body of Scotland, as much at heart, in parliamentary measures, as they may have that of their constituents either in Westminster or Stafford? Has not Mr. Erskine the interest of Manchester,

his Majesty's gracious Speech, reprobated in severe terms the measures the Ministry had adopted, for suppressing Paine's libellous pamphlets; and did not scruple to say, that he agreed with him in the general principles. Hence we hear such doctrines espoused and defended by Mr. Grey and Mr. B. we begin either to doubt the existence of those abilities we have often praised, or regret that their talents should be so obviously perverted, as for even to be a blot on the escutcheon of their integrity.

mingin,

mingham, and other manufacturing towns as much at heart, as he has that of Portsmouth, which he actually represents? And though these manufacturing towns, as well as many others in England and Scotland, have no *natural* representatives in parliament, is it from thence to be inferred, that their interests would be neglected in the House of Commons? No; there is not a member in that house, but would exert his abilities to transact any parliamentary business they might require or stand in need of. Can these wise reformers pretend to say, that the end of any representative's coming into parliament, is solely to attend to local interests, when he is supposed to have the interest of the nation at large at heart? If there are such, they are not worthy of the trust reposed in them by their constituents. If the charge of corruption among representatives, as well as the electors, is well founded, why increase the evil by these plans of reform? But the drifts, however, of the strenuous reformers of the present day are now too obvious to impose longer on the good sense of this nation. The popular object of reform with the triumvirate leaders

is

is but a mere pretext, a secondary consideration, while they artfully disguise the real principles of ill timed ambition, and the lurking seeds by which all their proceedings are actuated! If, therefore, the object of reform is ever to be in any manner effected, it must be by sober and temperate measures, and, at a time, when the nation and parliament are so circumstanced, as to be able to give it the most cool and deliberate consideration.

At a juncture like the present, when various opinions are afloat, which have been propagated with the utmost art and assiduity, tending to kindle, in the minds of the lower classes of society, a spirit of disaffection and discontent. At a time too, when the nation is engaged in a *war of defence*, provoked by open acts of violence, and the audacious and perfidious commencement of hostilities on the part of France; and which, for the protection of our rights and liberties, renders a general concurrence of the measures of the executive power so necessary. At such a period, and under such circumstances, every British heart, glowing with a love for his country, and sensible of the transcendant blessings of our glorious Constitution,

G

ought



ought to hold, in the most sovereign contempt, the seditious zeal of reforming clubs, in various parts of the kingdom, whose specious schemes of making the lower orders dissatisfied with their condition, are subservient to the latent motives of restless ambition, rancorous disappointment, and factious interests, by which the leaders of parliamentary reform are at this crisis actuated.

Notwithstanding, of all the engines and specious pretexts devised by art and human ingenuity, in opposition to the measures of Government, and which are influenced more by passion than principle, with a view to check the energy of ministry, it is to be hoped and trusted, for the happiness of mankind in general, and the prosperity of Great Britain in particular, that the most vigorous efforts, and the greatest unanimity will still prevail in the prosecution of a just and unavoidable war, into which we have been forced, in vindicating our national honour, and in defending our glorious constitution: A Constitution, "*take it all and all, the world will never see its like again;*" which has been reared on a firm basis, by the aggregate wisdom of ages, and stands displayed to

view

view, the envy and admiration of surrounding nations; and we trust, as far as any mortal fabric can, it will be immortal. We shall, therefore, close the subject, with the expiring wish of the famous father Paul to his country—" *Esse perpetua!* "

F I N I S.